

REMARKS

The Examiner and Applicants held a telephonic interview on Friday, June 27, 2008. At this interview, differences between the cited art and the pending claims were discussed. Agreement was reached on incorporating the limitations of a dependent claim into an independent claim to further distinguish from the cited art. Applicants thank the Examiner for his time.

Accordingly, the limitations recited by dependent claims 2, 14, 27 and 30 are incorporated into independent claims 1, 13, 26 and 29, respectively. Dependent claims 2, 14, 27 and 30 are canceled. Dependent claims 3-5, 15-17, 28 and 31 are amended to align antecedent basis resulting from these amendments to independent claims 1, 13, 26 and 29. No new matter has been added with these amendments.

Thus, claims 1, 3-13, 15-26, 28-29 and 31 are pending in this application.

Claim Rejections Under 35 USC §102

Applicants respectfully traverse the rejection of claims 1, 3-13, 15-26, 28-29 and 31 under 35 U.S.C. 102(e) as being anticipated by *Srivastava*, US Publication No. 2005/0160431 (“*Srivastava*”) in light of the following arguments.

Claims 1-12 are Not Anticipated by *Srivastava*:

Applicants respectfully submit that *Srivastava* does not disclose, suggest or teach at the each and every element of amended independent claim 1. Item 7, page 3 of the Office Action cites to *Srivastava* [0016]-[0017] as disclosing the elements of claim 1, however, *Srivastava* [0016]-[0017] does not disclose, teach or suggest at least the elements

the request identification boundary comprising a change to an identification of the single request during the occurrence of the one or more events, the request identification boundary selected from a group of request identification boundaries including processing the single request by a first and a second server component...

a second request identification [and]

marking, within the trace log, the change to the identification of the single request from the first request identification to the second request identification.

For example, the Office Action appears to have construed Srivastava's "state sequence number (SSN)" to be the request identification of claim 1. A careful reading of Srivastava [0016] shows that in Srivastava, multiple states occur in an event (lines 10-12), a sequence of related events defines a protocol (lines 18-19), a protocol definition includes an identification for the protocol (lines 20-21), and the protocol or sequence of events may span thread, processes, and/or nodes (lines 12-16). Therefore, Srivastava's protocol identification, not the SSN, may be construed as the request identification of claim 1, as both refer to a series of related events.

In Srivastava, each occurrence of the protocol may have an "occurrence sequential number (OSN)" by which the occurrence is identified (Srivastava [0018]). Unlike the request identification of claim 1, however, both Srivastava's protocol identification and OSN remain constant across boundaries, such as nodes and threads. Srivastava clearly teaches the uniqueness of the identification in [0018]: "It may be desirable to ensure that each OSN is unique. If the protocol spans across multiple nodes, then one approach to ensure uniqueness is to include the node number of the node that initiated the occurrence in the description of the OSN." Thus, Srivastava teaches that an OSN is unique across a node or multiple nodes.

Srivastava further emphasizes this uniqueness of the identification across threads. Srivastava [0020] states "...the threads [i.e., thread 1 and thread 2] reside on a single node." Continuing in [0021], Srivastava teaches a token that is passed from thread 1 to thread 2 "include[s] the protocol identification [and] the OSN..." Thus, Srivastava teaches that even for a change in threads on a single node, the OSN remains unique.

Claim 1, however, clearly recites that the request identification changes across boundaries, such as across a first and second server component or node. As Srivastava's protocol or request is uniquely identified across events, nodes and threads and does not have a change of identification, Srivastava does not teach, suggest or disclose at least the elements of claim 1:

the request identification boundary comprising a change to an identification of the single request during the occurrence of the one or more events, the request identification boundary selected

from a group of request identification boundaries including processing the single request by a first and a second server component...

a second request identification [and]

marking, within the trace log, the change to the identification of the single request from the first request identification to the second request identification.

The present application provides benefit over Srivastava by furnishing the ability to trace a request without the need for a globally unique request identifier. Instead of having to pre-define and uniquely identify a protocol or request (Srivastava, Figure 1, reference 10 and [0016]), the present application provides a method to track a request across identification boundaries, thus eliminating the need for global identifiers and their administration across nodes and threads. Furthermore, the methods of the present application save effort and time for developers. Existing local known identifiers in nodes and threads may be used without requiring extra code modification to define and test a global identifier for each protocol or request that is executed in a node or by a thread.

For at least these reasons, Srivastava does not teach, disclose or suggest each and every element of claim 1, and therefore does not anticipate amended independent claim 1 under 35 U.S.C. 102(e).

Claims 3-6 and 10-12 depend from amended independent claim 1. Claim 7 depends from claim 6, and claims 8-9 depend from claim 7. Dependent claims 3-12 incorporate every element of the claims from which they depend. Therefore, for at least reasons similar to claim 1, Srivastava also does not anticipate dependent claims 3-12 under 35 U.S.C. 102(e).

Claims 13, 15-26, 28-29 and 31 are Not Anticipated by Srivastava:

The Office Action rejected claims 13, 15-26, 28-29 and 31 based upon the same rationale as the rejections of claims 1 and 3-12. For at least reasons similar to those discussed for claims 1 and 3-12, Applicants respectfully submit Srivastava also does not anticipate claims 13, 15-26, 28-29 and 31 under 35 U.S.C. 102(e).

CONCLUSION

In view of the above amendment and arguments, Applicants submit the pending application is in condition for allowance and an early action so indicating is respectfully requested.

The Commissioner is authorized to charge any fee deficiency required by this paper, or credit any overpayment, to Deposit Account No. 13-2855, under Order No. 30835/154731, from which the undersigned is authorized to draw.

Dated: July 25, 2008

Respectfully submitted,

By___/W. J. Kramer #46,229/___
William J. Kramer
Registration No.: 46,229
MARSHALL, GERSTEIN & BORUN LLP
233 S. Wacker Drive, Suite 6300
Sears Tower
Chicago, Illinois 60606-6357
(312) 474-6300
Attorney for Applicant